

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding final Office Action mailed April 20, 2004. Upon entry of the amendments in this response, claims 3 – 9 and 22 - 23 remain pending. In particular, Applicants have amended claims 3 - 7 and have canceled claims 10 - 21 without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer. Applicants have canceled claims 10 - 21 merely to reduce the number of disputed issues and to facilitate early allowance and issuance of other claims in the present application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of these canceled claims in a continuing application, if Applicants so choose, and do not intend to dedicate the canceled subject matter to the public. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

Indication of Allowable Subject Matter

The Office Action indicates that claims 4 and 7 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Additionally, the Office Action indicates that claims 22 and 23 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as set forth in the action, and to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. As set forth above, Applicants have amended the claims and respectfully assert that claims 4, 7, 22, 23 and their respective dependent claims are in condition for allowance.

Objections to the Claims

The Office Action indicates that claim 21 stands objected to because of minor informalities. As set forth above, Applicants have canceled claim 21 and respectfully assert that the rejection has been rendered moot.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

The Office Action indicates that claims 22 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Office Action indicates that claim 22 recites “such third component is not located between the first wafer and the second wafer,” and that claim 23 recites “the third wafer supports a fourth component,” and that there is no description in the submitted disclosure of a third component as claimed or a fourth component as claimed. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

In this regard, Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner’s attention to FIGs. 7 – 9, 11 and 13 – 15 and the accompanying description. By way of example, FIG. 9 depicts two die assemblies (902, 904), each of which includes a portion of a second wafer 504. Each of these die assemblies includes multiple components, a third one of which (526 in die 902, and 528 in die 904) is not located between the first wafer and the second wafer. Applicants respectfully note that in claim 22, the location of the third component is recited with respect to “after exposing the first portion and the second portion of the first wafer.” Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that there is adequate disclosure to support the limitations recited in claim 22, that the limitations do not constitute new matter, and that the rejection as to claim 22 is improper.

With respect to the recited “fourth component” of claim 23, Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner’s attention to FIGs. 11 and 13 – 15, which show multiple

components located as recited in claim 23. Applicants respectfully note that the schematic side views of FIGs. 13 – 15 may obscure the presentation of components that are aligned with components 1308, 1402, 1502 and 1506. However, the schematic plan view of FIG. 11 shows that there are multiple components that may be located as recited in claim 23. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that an adequate written description has been provided, that claim 23 adds no new matter, and that the rejection is improper. Applicants respectfully request, therefore, that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 be removed.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Office Action indicates that claims 3, 5 – 7, 9 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(3) as being anticipated by *Yoshihara*. As set forth above, Applicants have canceled claims 21 and respectfully assert that the rejection as to this claim has been rendered moot. With respect to the remaining claims, Applicants have amended the dependency of these claims such that each now depends either directly or indirectly from a claim that has been indicated as being in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection has been accommodated.

Cited Art Made of Record

The cited art made of record has been considered, but is not believed to affect the patentability of the presently pending claims.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the now pending claims 3 – 9 and 22 - 23 are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,



M. Paul Qualey, Jr., Reg. No. 43, 024

**THOMAS, KAYDEN,
HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.**
100 Galleria Parkway N.W., Suite 1750
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450,

on 5/21/04.

Stephanie Riley

Signature